

enced but the same for all. The universal moment of reckoning, however, lay in the past. Mesopotamians, therefore, described highest knowledge, the alpha and omega, to be knowledge of what occurred before the deluge and after death. In this symmetry, the death of the world was in the past and only a person's individual death lay in the future.

2

Millennialism and Eschatology in the Zoroastrian Tradition

Philip G. Kreyenbroek

In the 1920s R. Reitzenstein, a classicist whose views helped to shape the academic approach to the study of religion in his time,¹ claimed that Hellenistic apocalyptic literature, and underlying earlier Greek and Platonic ideas, were strongly influenced by ancient Iranian teachings.² A central point of his argument was that the myth or legend³ of a sequence of deteriorating ages each of which is associated with a metal, found in the work of the early Greek poet Hesiod, also forms part of the Iranian tradition. Reitzenstein's principal Iranian source was the *Zand-i Wahman Yasn*, which received its final redaction in written form in the ninth or tenth century CE, but which the German scholar nevertheless held to represent a very ancient Iranian tradition.

Long before Reitzenstein's time, the parallel between the biblical Book of Daniel 2: 31–45 and the account of the 'metallic ages' found in the *Zand-i Wahman Yasn* had been noted,⁴ and some scholars thought that the biblical passage depended on the tradition represented by the Iranian text.

As a result of the prominence of such ideas in the views of historians of religion in earlier decades, both the *Zand-i Wahman Yasn* and the concept of 'apocalyptic' traditions came to play a greater role in the study of Zoroastrian teachings on future world history, millennialism and eschatology, than might otherwise have been the case. In fact, while few modern Iranists would now subscribe to the crucial premise that the myth of the 'metallic ages' is of ancient Iranian origin,⁵ a special interest in the question as to whether or not Zoroastrian teaching inspired Mediterranean and Near Eastern apocalyptic traditions continues to inform the scholarly debate down to the present.⁶

Not only has this had the effect of unduly narrowing the focus of Iranian studies in the field of millennialism and eschatology, but it has in some cases threatened to distort these studies, since general definitions of apocalypticism

based largely on other traditions were used prescriptively in the interpretation of the Zoroastrian sources.⁷ The range of questions and topics relevant to such a restricted treatment of the ancient Iranian tradition, moreover, would now seem to have been examined from all sides without bringing specialists closer to a consensus.

It may therefore be more profitable at this stage to seek to understand ancient Iranian ideas about eschatology and millennialism within the context of Zoroastrianism, and its textual tradition, as a whole. In tracing the possible development of eschatological and millenarian ideas there, some emphasis will be laid on one of the distinguishing characteristics of this tradition, namely the fact that writing played at most a minor role there until well into the Islamic era. While it is recognized in most modern publications on Zoroastrianism that the tradition is based on long oral transmission, the practical implications of this are often ignored.

A Survey of Zoroastrian Beliefs on Eschatology and Millennialism

The most elaborate account of the Zoroastrian teachings on the creation, progress and end of the world are found in the 'Pahlavi Books',⁸ works that were written down in their final redaction in the ninth and tenth centuries CE, in most cases after a long period of oral transmission. The accounts they contain thus represent Zoroastrian teachings as they have developed until then, i.e. essentially in their final form.⁹ The essential elements of the history and future of the world as described there are as follows.¹⁰

Cosmogony and eschatology: their moral purpose and implications In the beginning God (Pahlavi [Phl.] Ohrmazd; Avestan [Av.] Ahura Mazda,¹¹ 'Lord Wisdom'), created the world because, being all-good and omniscient, he was aware of the presence in the universe of his antagonist, the evil Ahriman (Av. Angra Mainyu, 'Evil Spirit'). At that stage the universe was a-dynamic, nothing moved and time did not exist. Ohrmazd knew that it would be impossible to rid the universe of Ahriman unless the forces of good and evil could do battle in a dynamic world which was limited as to both time and place.

Ohrmazd therefore created the world, first in an ideal, non-material state; then in material, but still ideal, form. This ideal world was contained by the sky as the contents of an egg in its shell. Inside this 'egg' the earth – small and flat – floated on a limited mass of water; on it stood one bull, one plant and a single human. Thus six of the seven 'creations' (man, animal, plant, metal, water, earth) were present in the ideal material creation.¹² The seventh,

fire, may have been represented by the sun, but does not appear to be mentioned in this context.¹³ Fire, which was thought to make movement possible, is said to have entered the world when its dynamic stage began.¹⁴

Time had been created at this stage, but did not progress, and the sun always stood at its zenith. In order to be armed for battle Ohrmazd had created seven¹⁵ divine helpers, the Amesha Spentas or 'beneficent immortals': 'Beneficent Spirit'; 'Righteousness'; 'Good Thought'; 'Beneficent Devotion'; 'the Power that should be chosen';¹⁶ 'Wholeness'; and 'Immortality'. Each of these in a sense represents an 'abstract' force that is operative in the universe and also has a connection with a material 'creation'.¹⁷

Ahriman, whose first attempt to conquer the world had been repulsed, created his own demons (Phl. *dew*; Av. *daeva*) and evil creatures.¹⁸ All creations except man have the inherent nature of their creator, which means that beings belonging to Ohrmazd can only be good and creatures of Ahriman have no choice but to be wicked. Man, however, is capable of moral choice and thus of playing a crucial role in the cosmic drama by aiding and strengthening the side of his choice.¹⁹

At the end of the ideal material state Ormazd is said to have celebrated a religious ceremony (*yasna*), and to have invited the eternal part of human souls (*fravashi*) to enter the world of 'Mixture' (viz. between good and evil) that was to come, in order to contribute to the fight against evil. The *fravashi* agreed to the invitation to come to the world.²⁰

The world of Mixture – the dynamic phase of world history during which good and evil are mixed and time progresses – then began with a successful attack by Ahriman on Ohrmazd's ideal world. Ahriman entered the shell-like sky and proceeded to kill or spoil all that was in it: where there was light he brought darkness, sweet water he turned briny, and he polluted fire with smoke; he further pounded the first plant and killed the first bull and man. For a short time he appeared to be victorious, but then Ohrmazd's creations began to act according to their inherent nature, which meant fighting against evil and pollution. From the first plant, animal and man sprang all species of good living beings, and eventually the world became as we know it: with birth and death, night and day, sweet and salt water, good and dangerous animals, plains and mountains, and the forces of evil pitted against those of good.

Although the fact that the world was in essence created by Ohrmazd is taken to mean that it must eventually return to its true nature, it is nevertheless implied in many Zoroastrian texts that this ideal state cannot come about without the active cooperation of man. In fact the entire Zoroastrian system of ethics is based upon the concept of human choice, and its consequences. Given the Zoroastrian view of the world of Mixture, it is clear that the good cannot automatically expect to be rewarded in this life. Zoroastrianism

teaches that justice will come after death, when the individual soul will face a judgment at the 'Bridge of the Separator', and will either be rewarded by heavenly bliss, or expiate its sins in hell.²¹ After death, a person's existence is thus once more a 'spiritual' one.

Eventually, however, when the world has almost fulfilled its function as an arena and evil will be sufficiently weakened, the process leading to the 'Renovation' will begin. That term (Phl. *Frashegerd*; Av. *frasho-kereti*, which perhaps means 'making perfect'),²² denotes a renewed non-dynamic, timeless and ideal state, but one in which all evil has been eliminated from the world and all men will be restored to physical life (the *tan i pasen* or 'final body'). The process begins with the appearance of the Saviour (Saoshyant), born of a virgin who will conceive when bathing in a lake where Zarathustra's 'essence' is preserved.²³

The Saoshyant will bring about the Resurrection, and will hold an assembly of all men and women in which they will realize their good and wicked deeds. There will be a Final Judgment and those to whom sin still clings will undergo another short period of punishment in hell (this time not as spirits but in the material body), while the righteous will again enjoy the delights of paradise.

Then all the metal contained in the mountains of the earth will be melted. A river of molten metal will thus be formed, through which all men must pass; for those who are free of sins, this will be like a bath in warm milk, but those whose sins have not been completely atoned for will experience a fierce burning. All men, thus cleansed, will then meet together and praise Ohrmazd.

Ohrmazd and the good divine beings will seize their evil opponents and ultimately defeat them. First the Saoshyant will celebrate a religious ceremony (*yasna*), after which the divine beings will engage in the final battle, which will drive out the powers of evil for ever. After this Ohrmazd himself will perform a final *yasna*.

Then the mountains will be razed, and *Frashegerd* will begin.²⁴

The millennia An important subsidiary theme in Middle Persian and later accounts of the history of the universe is formed by speculations on the time-frame within which this history is expected to take place. The significant units of time in these speculations are periods of 1,000 and 3,000 years.²⁵ The figure most often given in the Pahlavi Books is that of 12,000 years. Elsewhere, including in early non-Iranian sources, the figure of 9,000 years is found, which may indicate that the 3,000-year period of ideal spiritual existence did not play a role in earlier speculations.²⁶ According to this millenary scheme, the history of the world proceeds as follows:

Pre-eternity: Ohrmazd is aware of the potential threat of Ahriman, and of the need to create the world in order to render him powerless.

0–3,000: First there are 3,000 years of spiritual creation, in which the creations remained in a non-material, motionless state.²⁷ This period ends with a first aborted attempt by Ahriman to enter the creation of Ohrmazd. Ohrmazd first offers Ahriman peace on condition that the evil one will subject himself to him, but this is refused. A pact is then agreed upon, whereby the two forces will do battle for the next 9,000 years.²⁸ Ohrmazd chants the Ahunawar prayer, the holiest of all sacred utterances of Zoroastrianism. When Ahriman hears those sacred words he falls back into the darkness, where he remains inactive for 3,000 years.

3,000–6,000: This marks the beginning of the second 3,000 years, in which Ohrmazd – unhampered by the antagonism of Ahriman – first creates time,²⁹ then the Amesha Spentas,³⁰ and subsequently fashions the rest of his creation in material form.³¹ Although Ahriman is generally said to have been inactive, it is also stated that he created his own evil creatures during this period.³² At the end of this period, Ohrmazd performs a 'spiritual *yasna*',³³ and invites the *fravashis* ('souls', see above) to come to the world of Mixture.

6,000–9,000: The next 3,000 years begin with a successful attack by Ahriman, and end with the appearance of Zarathustra. Time begins to progress and eventually the world becomes as we know it. The rest of this period, from a Zoroastrian point of view, is quintessentially pre-history, a time when legendary heroes had their being. It is, somewhat vaguely, subdivided into three millennia:³⁴

6,000–7,000: The first 1,000 years witnessed the effects of Ahriman's attack and some legendary exploits.

7,000–8,000: During the second 1,000 years the wicked Azdahak ruled until he was finally imprisoned by the hero Fredon.

8,000–9,000: The following millennium saw many of the deeds and battles which are described in the Iranian heroic legends.³⁵

9,000–12,000: The third period of 3,000 years then follows, beginning with Zarathustra and destined to end with *Frashegerd*. This period was naturally of particular interest to Zoroastrians, as it includes the present age. Many different traditions about it may have existed side by side before the demands of a written tradition forced the compilers to impose a sort of unity. Thus, in some Pahlavi sources, the period is not only divided into three millennia, but the first of these, Zarathustra's millennium, is further subdivided into four (or seven) deteriorating 'metallic ages':

9,000–10,000: The first millennium began with Zarathustra's revelation. Supported by his royal patron, Vishtaspa, Zarathustra brought the

Zoroastrian religion to the world. During Vishtaspa's reign there were terrible wars with unbelievers. His reign was followed by those of other kings, including the last of the Achaemenians (on the historical figures see below), who was defeated by the evil rule of Alexander. Then the Parthian kings reigned, followed by the Sasanians, until the last scion of that house was forced to flee before the wicked Arabs.³⁶

From then on calamity is destined to follow calamity, and Iran will be overrun by various wicked aliens. Towards the end of this period the wonder-working Wahram will appear, who will restore the Zoroastrian religion³⁷ and will help to prepare the world for the coming of the first of Zarathustra's miraculously-born sons. Wahram's coming is followed by the reappearance of Peshotan, the son of Zarathustra's patron Vishtaspa. Until then Peshotan has dwelt in a mysterious place. He will also help to defeat the forces of evil.

9,000–10,000 subdivided: According to a group of traditions, Zarathustra's millennium will in turn see four or seven deteriorating epochs. The four are: a *golden* age belonging to Zarathustra and Vishtaspa; a *silver* age, which belongs to the first Sasanian; a *steel* age, viz. that of the pious, late Sasanian king Khusraw of immortal soul; and an age of '*iron mixed with clay*',³⁸ when the world will be dominated by evil people and wicked demons.

In the alternative tradition, the seven deteriorating ages are: *gold* – King Vishtaspa; *silver* – Kay Ardasher; *copper* – Ardasher, the first Sasanian; *brass* – the Parthian Kings; *lead* – the Sasanian King Wahram Gor; *steel* – Khusraw of immortal soul; *iron mixed with clay* – the demons.³⁹

10,000–11,000: Wahram and Peshotan are, in a way, the forerunners of Ushedarmah, the first of Zarathustra's saviour-sons.⁴⁰ Like Zarathustra he will receive a revelation from Ohrmazd and bring this to the people. The sun will stand still at the zenith of the sky for ten days and nights. Drought and affliction will diminish, prosperity and peace will increase. Trees will be green for three years. Rivers and springs will flow again. The wolf species will disappear for ever, and the effectiveness of medicines will be such that none will die of illness.

Towards the end of this millennium, however, the sorcerer Malkus, who belongs to the family of Zarathustra's murderer, will bring torrential rain, hail and snow for three years, causing much destruction.⁴¹ According to one source,⁴² Peshotan will appear to counteract the demonic Arabs, Turks and Romans, who will once more become dominant.

11,000–12,000: Then Ushedarmah, the second of Zarathustra's saviour-

sons will appear, according to some sources with Peshotan as his priestly counsellor.⁴³ Ushedarmah will receive a revelation from Ohrmazd. The sun will stand still at the zenith of the sky for twenty days and nights. Serpents will be destroyed. Trees will remain green for six years. Hunger and thirst will diminish. Cattle will give much milk; people will first give up eating meat and then drinking milk. Joy and righteousness will increase.

Towards the end of the millennium Azhdahak, who has been imprisoned since the second millennium after Ahriman's attack (see under 7,000–8,000), will escape and cause great destruction. The legendary hero Keresasp will be brought back to life in order to slay him.⁴⁴

12,000–12,057: Then the Saoshyant, Astvat-ereta, will come from Lake Kayansih, and the process leading to *Frashegerd* will commence. The sun will stand still for thirty days and nights. Plants will be green for ever, and joy will reign. All forms of evil, such as illness and death, will vanish from the world, and the Resurrection will begin (for details see above), followed by the cleansing stream of molten metal, the Saoshyant's *yasna*, the final battle between the forces of good and evil; Ohrmazd's final *yasna*, and the levelling of the mountains.

12,057: With this the Renovation is achieved.⁴⁵

Moral message and millenary scheme The sources reflect no awareness of any logical or doctrinal contradiction between the idea that the fate of the world largely depends on men's moral choices, and this millennial scheme which seems to imply that even the details of the eventual outcome of the cosmic battle are preordained. Nor is an explanation offered for the apparent discrepancy between the expectation that the righteous will gradually but steadily rid the world of evil, and the prediction that things will go downhill from the appearance of one saviour-figure until the next. A compromise between these schemes has apparently been reached by describing the appearance of Zarathustra's first two saviour-sons as causing great improvements which are then in some measure counteracted by renewed manifestations of evil.

On the History of the Zoroastrian Religion and its Textual Tradition

Pre-history, Zarathustra, the Gathas Zarathustra (Greek [Gk.] *Zoroastrès*), the founder of the Zoroastrian faith, was in all probability a priest who was highly trained in the religious tradition of the Indo-Iranians. His ritual and visionary activities, it seems, led him to make claims that brought him into

conflict with powerful elements in his surroundings, and caused his followers to be regarded as a distinct group, and eventually as followers of a separate religious tradition. There has been much debate in the past over Zarathustra's date; most modern scholars hold that he flourished around 1,000 BCE, or slightly earlier. This probably implies that the Prophet lived before the Iranian peoples had settled in the areas they now inhabit; it is thought that he belonged to one of the peoples who later settled in the eastern part of the Iranian territory.

Whatever the uncertainties as to Zarathustra's exact date and place, there is no doubt that he lived in pre-historical times, i.e. before his people began to make use of writing. Nevertheless, the text of the *Gathas*, a group of hymns attributed to Zarathustra, have been transmitted almost exactly as the Prophet must have recited them. Presumably because of their status as especially sacred texts, they seem to have been memorized word-for-word, or indeed syllable by syllable, so that they did not change along with the living language as other parts of the early religious tradition did.⁴⁶

The early centuries of Zoroastrianism, the non-Gathic texts While Zarathustra's *Gathas* formed the core of the religious tradition of the nascent Zoroastrian faith, its early tradition probably included many other texts, not least the *Yashts* or hymns to the divine beings. The core of many of these texts may have been composed long before Zarathustra's time, but it is clear that additions were made to them in the course of the history of Zoroastrianism and it seems possible that passages which were frowned upon by adherents of the new religion were simply dropped.⁴⁷ The whole corpus of religious texts in this Old Iranian language later came to be known as the *Avesta*; for want of a better term its language is called *Avestan*.

The Achaemenians (559–331 BCE), and the fixation of the Avesta The earlier stages of the development of Zoroastrianism thus took place in pre-history. Early believers must have brought the faith from somewhere in Central Asia to the eastern parts of the Iranian lands, whence it gradually seems to have spread to the West along ancient trade routes.⁴⁸ The first literate civilization to adhere to Zoroastrianism was that of the Achaemenian empire,⁴⁹ whose centre was in western Iran and which, unlike the eastern Iranian areas, was directly exposed to the influence of the high cultures of Western Asia, notably Mesopotamia.

The fact that the Achaemenians were Zoroastrians must have done much to promote the status of the Zoroastrian priesthood, and may also have contributed to the notion that adherence to the 'Good Religion' brought divine blessing, which led to worldly success. This association between divine

approval and worldly success presumably made the later overthrow of the Zoroastrian dynasty by the unbeliever Alexander especially painful and traumatic for Zoroastrians.

It is thought that the local western Iranian priesthood, the Magi, adopted the Zoroastrian religion. Although they must have spoken western Iranian languages (Old Persian and Median), they evidently accepted *Avestan*, an eastern Iranian tongue, as a liturgical language. It seems likely that the first generations of Magi were trained by immigrant priests who were native speakers of *Avestan*. These early Zoroastrian Magi probably had an active command of the language, which enabled them to add to, or alter, existing texts to some extent. Later generations, however, seem largely to have contented themselves with a passive comprehension of *Avestan*. Initially that language must have been about as close to the native languages of the Magi as modern Spanish is to Italian, and they presumably understood much of what they recited.⁵⁰ As Old Persian developed further, however, the *Avestan* texts must have become increasingly difficult to follow. No way was evidently found to teach active knowledge of this ancient language and priests must have memorized the sacred texts parrot-fashion. Thus the *Avestan* texts, most of which had until then continued in free and presumably fluid transmission, became 'fixed' at least to the extent that no major additions could be made for want of an active command of the sacred tongue. It would still have been possible to add simple sentences or fixed formulae in which a new name was substituted for another.

Although Achaemenid culture was to some extent literate, the religious tradition continued to be transmitted orally.⁵¹ Liturgical text must have been memorized by boys from priestly families from an early age.⁵² A number of these went on to do higher religious studies, which, to judge by later practice, probably included exegesis⁵³ and other skills needed to interpret the religion. As comprehension of *Avestan* became so weak that measures were needed to prevent all loss of comprehension of the textual tradition, priests solved the problem by devising a system of word-for-word translation which – although grammatically and at times logically awkward – was simple enough to be memorized along with the *Avestan* original.⁵⁴ In the course of time this translation, known as *Zand*,⁵⁵ came to include explanatory comments by great teachers. Later, texts which were felt to be authoritative – and thus as having formed part of the divine revelation to Zarathustra – were also added to the *Zand*, even if no *Avestan* original was known to exist. In this way, knowledge of non-Iranian origin could be incorporated into the religious tradition. This must have given the religion the flexibility it needed to adapt to new circumstances, admitting as good Zoroastrian teaching views which originated in circumstances of which Zarathustra would have had no knowledge.

Alexander and the Seleucids The defeat of the Achaemenian empire by Alexander the Great (known to the Iranians as 'Alexander the Accursed') in or around 331 BCE, clearly had grave consequences for Zoroastrianism. Under Alexander and his successors, the Seleucids, the faith lost both its political influence and its cultural dominance. Outside influences – notably Hellenism, which blended elements from different cultures into a new whole – clearly had some influence on Zoroastrianism, as they affected the Zoroastrians' public life. However, the structure of Zoroastrian religious life, with its hereditary priesthood, its emphasis on ritual, its fixed Avestan liturgy and learned *Zand* tradition, ensured that the effects of such influences were limited.

The Parthians (third century BCE to 226 CE) and the Sasanians (226–651) With the rise of a new Iranian dynasty, the Parthians or Arsacids, Zoroastrianism once more had an Iranian dynasty to protect it. There is no reason to assume that the Parthians were bad Zoroastrians,⁵⁶ although they were depicted as such by their successors, the Sasanians. Sasanian propaganda stressed the religious orthodoxy of the new political establishment, and priesthood and Church were very influential during this period. Perhaps as a result of challenges from Christianity and Manichaeism,⁵⁷ both of which claimed that the purity of their tradition was safeguarded by the existence of written sources, writing apparently came to be seen as a valuable tool for the preservation of the religion and in the course of the Sasanian era an alphabet was devised which could adequately render the sounds of the Avestan language. Those Avestan texts which were known in the Sasanian era were committed to writing for the first time.⁵⁸

The Islamic conquest of Iran (c. 650 CE) In the mid-seventh century CE, the conquest of Iran by the armies of Islam put an end to the political and cultural hegemony of the Zoroastrian 'Church' in that country. At first only a limited number of Iranians appear to have been attracted to the new religion, while a majority accepted the status of second-class citizens (*dhimmi*) and continued in the faith of their forefathers. Gradually, however, Islamic culture became dominant in Iran, and increasing numbers of Zoroastrians converted. The remaining Zoroastrian communities consequently became steadily poorer and more marginal, and it may have become clear around the ninth century CE that they would not in future be able to support the extensive body of scholar-priests needed to keep their oral tradition alive. A group of priests then devoted itself to writing down (in Pahlavi, the language of Sasanian Iran) those elements of the religious tradition that seemed to them most relevant. The resulting works – i.e. most of the extant Pahlavi Books – were thus committed to writing under pressure in the ninth and tenth centuries

after a lengthy oral transmission. They are the product of a cultural tradition that had not yet acquired the sophistication of a developed written tradition, and in many cases appear to have been written down exactly as they had been transmitted in oral form.

This means that the extant Zoroastrian textual tradition is by its very nature ahistorical: with the exception of the *Gathas* and a few Pahlavi Books written by known authors, it can be assumed that both the Avesta and the Pahlavi literature are the final versions of texts which evolved in oral transmission over long periods of time, often absorbing various and heterogeneous traditions.

Eschatological ideas in Zarathustra's teachings

The Zoroastrian tradition on the whole claims to be a unified one, based wholly on Ahura Mazda's revelation to Zarathustra; this implies that what is found in the Pahlavi Books was held to be representative of Zarathustra's time as well as much later periods. Although it is true that a degree of continuity can be shown to exist from the earliest period until well into the post-Sasanian era,⁵⁹ such claims are of course too sweeping. The following pages will be devoted to an examination of the sources with a view to ascertaining which elements of Middle Persian eschatological and millenary accounts can be attributed to Zarathustra and the early history of Zoroastrianism, and which entered the tradition later.

On the difficulties of interpreting the *Gathas* The *Gathas* of Zarathustra belong to an intricate tradition of mantic poetry of which we know almost nothing. Moreover, they are the products of a pre-historic culture at whose realities we can only guess. If the exact meaning and implications of many passages thus escape us, there can be no doubt that the opposition between the forces of good and evil, and the human beings belonging to either, plays a central role there, and that each person's choice in this matter will have grave consequences both for the individual and for the world.

Judgment of the soul after death That the individual soul will find recompense after death is suggested by Yasna [Y]31.20:

He who may approach the truthful one, splendor will be his (reward), (as) contrasted with weeping, a long life in darkness, foul food, (and) the word 'woe': to that existence (your) religious view will lead you, O you deceitful one, on account of your own actions.⁶⁰

The same seems to be implied by Y46.10, where Zarathustra says:

That man or woman, O Wise Ahura, who will grant me (those things) which Thou knowest (to be) the best of existence ... with all those, I shall cross over the Bridge of the Separator.⁶¹

Zarathustra, in other words, will lead his flock at the time of the judgment of the soul, causing them to reach paradise, unlike the evil traditional priests and rulers, whose souls will recoil from them when they reach the bridge, to be 'for all time⁶² guests in the house of deceit (i.e. hell)⁶³ (Y46.11). This passage (Y46.10,11) could perhaps also be taken to mean that, at an early stage of his career, Zarathustra expected the world to become perfect during his lifetime and hoped to lead his followers to the Best Existence himself, while his opponents would be left to face the consequences of their wickedness. The image of a bridge to be crossed, however, seems to suggest the passage of souls to the hereafter rather than the 'making perfect' of this world. In later Zoroastrianism the image of the Bridge is certainly understood in this way.

The final battle and the End of Time Besides a judgment of the individual soul,⁶⁴ the *Gathas* also refer to a final contest between the forces of good and evil. Fire and molten metal are repeatedly mentioned in such contexts. Y44.15 speaks of a time 'when the two armies which have nothing in common will come together.' Y51.9 refers to a battle in which fire and molten metal play a role:

The satisfaction which Thou shalt give to both factions through Thy pure fire and the molten iron, Wise One, is to be given as a sign among living beings, in order to destroy the deceitful and save the truthful.⁶⁵

The *Gathas* emphatically mention recompense at this final point. In Y43.5 we find: 'Bad for the bad, a good reward for the good (each to be given) through Thy skill at the final turning point of creation.'⁶⁶ Similarly, Y30.8 says:

And thus, when the punishment for these sinners shall come to pass, then, for Thee, Wise One, shall the rule of good thinking be at hand, in order to be announced to those, Lord, who shall deliver deceit into the hands of truth.⁶⁷

When this process is completed, the world will become *frasha* or 'perfect' (cf. *frasho-kereti*, on which see above).

The term *Saoshyant* in the *Gathas* While one passage suggests that it is Ahura Mazda who plays the main role in achieving *frasho-kereti*,⁶⁸ elsewhere Zarathustra says (Y30.9): 'Therefore may we be the ones who shall make the world *frasha*.' This passage clearly suggests that Zarathustra's own actions and those of his contemporaries will have a direct bearing on the Last Things.

This appears to be confirmed by the Gathic use of the word *saoshyant*, which in the later tradition is used for the figure(s) who will save the world in a remote future. The word is a future participle of a root *sav*, which means, approximately, 'to bring advantage'.⁶⁹ Av. *saoshyant* is variously rendered by such terms as 'saviour' (Insler), 'benefactor' (Humbach), and 'celui promis à l'opulence' (Kellens and Pirart).

As Insler⁷⁰ has pointed out, the context of a key passage (Y46.3: 'The intentions of *those who shall save* are in accord with Thy mature teachings'), strongly suggest that Zarathustra's followers are collectively referred to as *saoshyants*. This seems to be confirmed by Y48.12:

Yes, those men shall be the saviors of the lands, namely, those who shall follow their knowledge of Thy teaching with actions in harmony with good thinking and with truth, Wise One. These indeed have been fated to be the expellers of fury.⁷¹

A little earlier in the text (Y46.9), Zarathustra uses the word *saoshyant* in a context where it almost certainly refers to himself:

When shall I know, Wise One, if ye have mastery through truth over anyone whose threat is inimical to me? Let the solemn words of good thinking be truly told to me. (For) he who shall save (*saoshyans*) shall know how his reward shall be.

Zarathustra seems to plead here with Ahura Mazda to demonstrate his power to protect the righteous, claiming his, Zarathustra's, right to know because he is one who 'shall save'.⁷²

The question then arises in what sense the future tense of the participle *saoshyant* is to be interpreted.⁷³ Unless one assumes that Zarathustra and his community initially expected to bring 'salvation' during their lifetime and realized later that this was not to be,⁷⁴ one might understand the Gathic term as meaning 'one who[se actions] will have the effect of bringing salvation in the future', which could obviously refer to Zarathustra, but also to those who collaborated with him towards the desired end.

The Evidence of the Young Avesta

The development of the concepts of the Saviour and the Resurrection of the dead Thus the concepts of heaven and hell, a judgment of the soul, and a final battle between the cosmic forces are attested in the *Gathas*. That final struggle, which may imply an end to time as we know it, involves fire and molten metal and will cause the world to become 'perfect'.⁷⁵ There is no clear reference there, however, to a physical resurrection of the dead, nor

does the word *saoshyant* appear to have the meaning it was to acquire later. Both concepts are found together, however, in Yasht [Yt]19, which contains references to many of the features of Zoroastrian eschatology as described in the later tradition.

In Yt19.89, the Saviour is called 'the living indestructible one', i.e. one to whom Ahrimanic evil cannot attain. In Yt19 this figure is also referred to as 'the victorious one among the Saoshyants', suggesting a semantic development whereby the once unspecific term *saoshyant*⁷⁶ gradually became closely associated with the concept of a single savior-figure, around whom legends developed. The relevant passages run as follows:⁷⁷

10: Ahura Mazda created many and good creatures ... (11) in order that they shall make the world perfect ... in order that the dead shall rise up, that the Living One, the Indestructible, shall come, the world be made perfect at his wish ...

89: ... the Victorious One among the Saoshyants⁷⁸ and also his other companions, so that he may make the world perfect, unchanging, undying, uncorrupted, undecaying, ever-living, ever-growing ...

92-3: When Astvat-ereta⁷⁹ comes out from Lake Kansaoya, the messenger of Ahura Mazda, son of Vispa-aurvairi⁸⁰ ... then he will there drive Evil out from the world of Righteousness.⁸¹

94: He will gaze with the eyes of wisdom, he will behold all creation of ...⁸² He will gaze with the eyes of sacrifice⁸³ on the whole material world and, watching, will make it indestructible.

95: His, victorious Astvat-ereta's, companions advance, thinking well, speaking well, acting well, of good religion; and indeed not speaking a false word with their tongues. Before them will flee the ill-fated (demon) Aeshma, with the bloody club. Righteousness will conquer the wicked (demon of) Evil, hideous, dark.

96: (The demon) Evil Thought will be overcome, (the Amesha Spenta) Good Thought will overcome him ... Ahriman, of evil works will flee, bereft of power.

In view of the way oral texts generally develop, the fact that the passages in question occur at the beginning and at the end of the main section of this hymn⁸⁴ suggests that they are later in origin than other parts of the text. The complexity of the text shows, however, that they originated at a time when it was still possible to compose freely in Avestan. This is confirmed by another text, Yt13.129, which refers to Astvat-ereta,⁸⁵ explaining his name and describing the effects of his appearance in some detail.⁸⁶

... who will be the Saoshyant, 'Victorious' by name, Astvat-ereta by name. (He

is called) Saoshyant because he will further⁸⁷ all material life; (he is called) Astvat-ereta because he will bring about material⁸⁸ safety (among) those who possess bodies (and) also life ...

The Last Things as portrayed by the Young Avesta While, as was shown earlier, Zarathustra's own *Gathas* refer to an End of Time, preceded by a final battle between the forces of evil and a cleansing by fire and molten metal, the so-called Young Avesta – consisting of texts which were transmitted relatively freely in the living language and could thus develop, perhaps until some time in the Achaemenian period – already shows many of the chief elements of the myth as we find it in the Pahlavi Books: there is the fully developed concept of a Saviour, whose appearance will lead to the Resurrection of the dead, whose activities have some connection with ritual sacrifice (cf. Yt19.94, 'gazing with the eyes of sacrifice'), and who will induce a final battle between the forces of good and evil, thus playing a crucial role in the process of making the world 'perfect'.

The Last Things and the First: 'mirroring' It is interesting to note that in Zoroastrian eschatology as it developed since the time of the Prophet, the Last Things have come to mirror the First almost completely, although in a compressed form.⁸⁹ According to the Pahlavi books, the sequence of the Cosmogony and early history of mankind is as follows (see also above):

1. Creation (in stages)
2. Ritual acts: Ohrmazd pronounces the holiest prayer, and later performs a sacrifice (*yasna*)
3. Ahriman enters the world and actualizes conflict
4. Fire brings movement
5. Death and sin come into the world
6. Zarathustra appears.

At the End of Time, the sequence is reversed:

6. The Saoshyant appears, representing Zarathustra
5. Death is vanquished by the Resurrection; the Final Judgment neutralizes sin
4. Fire and molten metal cleanse the world, doing away with the need for further dynamism
3. The final battle takes place between Good and Evil
2. Ritual acts (*yasna*) are performed, first by the Saoshyant and then by Ohrmazd
1. The Renovation mirrors Creation.

Of these elements of the eschatology, only the cleansing flow of molten metal has no obvious counterpart in the cosmogony. As it plays an important role in the *Gathas*, it seems likely that its presence in Zoroastrian eschatology goes back directly to Zarathustra's teaching.

The reappearance of early figures That the First Things were expected to mirror the Last is confirmed by a number of passages showing that prominent figures of Zarathustra's time were expected to return, or to be reborn, at the end of time.

An Avestan passage (Yt13.127) connects the name of Astvat-ereta, here called 'the latter-born' (*apara-zata*), with 'the latter-born Jamaspa' and 'the latter-born Maidyomangha'. Jamaspa and Maidyomangha are well-known contemporaries of Zarathustra,⁹⁰ who were evidently expected to appear again together with the Saoshyant.

In the *Greater Bundahishn* (GBd36.10), one of Zarathustra's 'naturally born' sons, Isat-vastra,⁹¹ is said to play a role at the time of the Final Judgment, where one would logically expect Astvat-ereta to officiate. This indicates that the two figures were closely linked in the minds of some Zoroastrians.

Thirdly, there are the repeated references to the role of Peshotan, the son of Zarathustra's patron Vishtaspa, in accounts of the future course of world history (see above).⁹²

Millenary and Cyclical Schemes

General The above account, however, covers only part of the course of world history as it is described in the Pahlavi Books. As Boyce puts it: 'The linear clarity of this ancient Zoroastrian apocalyptic, making known the course of events from the prophet's revelation to its fulfillment through his son, the Saoshyant, became blurred after scholar priests in western Iran had adopted a millennial scheme.'⁹³

As we saw earlier, the Pahlavi tradition divides the course of world history, past and future, into clear-cut periods of 3,000 and 1,000 years respectively, mentioning either three or four periods of 3,000 years⁹⁴ and subdividing the last into three periods of 1,000 years. These last millennia will progress in similar ways, and can thus be seen as repetitive cycles of history: beginning positively but with a recrudescence of evil towards the end. The first of these ages begins when Zarathustra receives his revelation, the following two will see the appearance of his miraculously-born sons, Ushedar (Av. Ukhshyat-ereta) and Ushedarmah (Av. Ukhshyat-nemah). After the last millennium, Astvat-ereta will appear and achieve the Renovation in fifty-seven years;

accounts of his activities are thus not determined by millenarian speculations. The names of Ukhshyat-ereta and Ukhshyat-nemah occur in the Avesta only once (Yt13.128), in a passage whose structure is simple enough to have allowed interpolation at a time when priests had lost most of their active command of Avestan.

Time speculations and the question of Zurvanism As far as one can judge, these novel elements enter the tradition in the context of a broader preoccupation with time, astronomy, astral fatalism and further speculations about fate and predestination. This development has been plausibly explained as a result of the influence of Babylonian culture, in which the study of astronomy – and thus presumably notions concerning the function of time – played an important role.⁹⁵

Because they occur in what appears to be a novel context, Zoroastrian millenarian ideas have widely been associated with Zurvanism, a creed or tradition which held that Zurvan, the God of Time, was more powerful than either Ohrmazd or Ahriman. These were in fact regarded as his twin sons,⁹⁶ to whom Zurvan had left dominion of the world. Definite periods of time (multiples of 1,000 years) are frequently mentioned in connection with such beliefs (see below), although they also occur in other contexts.

As far as one can judge, Zarathustra's message implies that the advent of the Renovation depends in part on the efforts and moral choice of each individual believer. This must logically mean that the time of these events cannot be predestined (although Ohrmazd's role as creator indicates that the world will eventually come to obey him only). On the other hand, time-speculations of the kind we find in the later tradition necessarily imply that the future course of world history is preordained; many Pahlavi texts in fact reflect a belief in fate and predetermination. This and other discrepancies⁹⁷ led many scholars to think of a dichotomy between Zoroastrian 'orthodoxy' and Zurvanism, which was seen as a heresy based on a fully developed doctrinal system, and which was distinct from 'orthodoxy' in all but ritual expression. Millennialism was therefore held to have been 'Zurvanite in origin [and] later somewhat awkwardly adapted to orthodox Zoroastrianism'.⁹⁸

The notion of a Zurvanite 'heresy', however, has in recent years been challenged with what appear to be plausible arguments, leading to the conclusion that 'what we have referred to as Zurvanism was never a sect or school of thought; but it was merely a fairly inoffensive variant of the Zoroastrian myth of creation, one of several'.⁹⁹ If this is right, or if Zurvanism was at least less radically separate from other forms of Zoroastrianism than was hitherto assumed, millennialism is to be regarded, not as an aberration but as an integral part of later Zoroastrian teaching.

On the implications of orality Both the status of Zurvanism and the existence of fairly widely diverging accounts of the millennial scheme in the sources can be better understood in the light of the realities of the tradition. As we saw earlier, for a long time Zoroastrian teachings were transmitted orally, first in priestly schools or traditions, and then in turn by learned priests to those who followed them. The available evidence suggests that, in both cases, questions and answers formed part of religious instruction, which means that questions reflecting current realities played a role in determining the content of future teaching. The absence of written sources would have made it difficult to delineate the precise boundaries of orthodox teaching when novel questions or points of view – such as those about a preordained time-frame for future events – arose. Furthermore, the lack of such a restrictive definition of acceptable belief may have made it almost impossible for many learned priests to respond to new questions simply by affirming that Zoroastrianism had no answers to offer.

Interaction between different theological views in oral traditions tends to be very limited,¹⁰⁰ moreover, and in the case of Zoroastrianism it can be demonstrated that a plurality of acceptable views existed where grave disputes might have arisen in a strongly literate environment. Since Zarathustra's original teaching that time will have an end probably formed a plausible basis for further-reaching speculations, it seems likely that millenary schemes came to exist side by side with ideas based on more ancient Zoroastrian teaching without being perceived as contradicting these.

Early references to millenary ideas The existence of a millenarian scheme in the Zoroastrian tradition is first attested by Plutarch's *De Iside et Osiride* 47:

Theopompus says that, according to the Magians, for three thousand years alternately the one god will dominate the other and be dominated, and that for another three thousand years they will fight and make war, until one smashes up the domain of the other. In the end Hades [i.e. the Evil spirit] shall perish and men shall be happy; neither shall they need sustenance nor shall they cast a shadow.¹⁰¹

Plutarch (c. 45–c. 125 CE) bases his account on the evidence of Theopompus, who was born in 376 BCE.¹⁰² This suggests that the essential elements¹⁰³ of a millenary scheme had become part of the tradition by the late Achaemenian period.

The later accounts of the Armenian Eznik of Kolb and the Syrian Theodore bar Konay,¹⁰⁴ which may derive from the same mid-Sasanian source,¹⁰⁵ describe how Zurvan offered sacrifice for 1,000 years in order to have a son. A moment

of doubt caused Ahriman to be conceived, whereas the virtue of the sacrifice itself led to the conception of Ohrmazd. When Zurvan became aware of the conception of twins, he promised to grant the dominion of the world to his first-born son. Ahriman was told of this by his omniscient twin, Ohrmazd, and pierced the womb in order to be first. Zurvan protested but had to abide by his oath, saying:

O false and injurious one! The kingship shall be granted to you for 9000 years; and (then) I shall establish Ohrmazd as ruler over you. And after 9000 years Ohrmazd shall reign and do all that he will wish to do. Then Ohrmazd and Ahriman set to fashioning the creatures.¹⁰⁶

While Plutarch thus describes an alternation of the fortunes of both powers, the two sources reflecting Sasanian beliefs depict the period of creation as belonging entirely to Ahriman. No mention is made of an age belonging to Zarathustra or to his sons – which suggests that these cyclical traditions developed in another milieu or at a later stage – but all sources agree in mentioning a period of 9,000 years.¹⁰⁷

Zarathustra's three sons, and cycles of history The few early sources at our disposal thus suggest that the numbers 3 and 1,000 played a particularly significant role in shaping Zoroastrian millenary accounts. This in itself may help to explain the development of a scheme in which the original Saoshyant is represented as the last of three saviour-figures. The Zoroastrian tradition, moreover, states that Zarathustra had three 'naturally-born' sons (Isat-vastra, Urvatat-nara and Hvare-cithra).¹⁰⁸ Given the belief in the reappearance of early prominent figures, it would not be far-fetched to assume that the notion of three 'saviour-figures' was also partly inspired by a cultural memory of his 'real' sons. Since Zarathustra's era, within which the three saviour-figures must logically appear, was thought to last for 3,000 years, the resulting tripartition of that age may well have presented itself as an obvious part of such millenarian speculations.

If that is so – i.e. if the notion of the three millennia of the last age originally was no more than a felicitous idea that had no basis in the earlier tradition – neither legends nor stories about the last two millennia or the first two saviour-figures could have existed. When the scheme eventually came to form part of the accepted tradition, the 'hollow millennia' may simply have been portrayed as echoes of the first one, which had begun with the blessed appearance of the prophet but had later deteriorated.

The cycles and their implications for the Zoroastrian worldview There appears to be no need, therefore, to look for an alien origin of the notion of

cyclical history in Zoroastrianism. However, the emergence of such a concept did imply that the perceived deterioration of world conditions since Zarathustra's ideal time had to be doctrinally explained in a novel way. While the Zoroastrian view of world history may originally have been largely 'linear' – with a steady progress towards the ideal state of the Renovation, interrupted at unpredictable intervals by the machinations of Ahriman – the belief in a succession of saviour-figures could only mean that a series of calamities would precede the advent of each as a preordained course of events.

Apocalyptic Ideas

The development of an Iranian apocalypse Whether it originated with the above developments or was merely strengthened by them, the view that communal suffering was part of a predestined scheme of things presumably helped Zoroastrians come to terms with such major adversities as the Macedonian and Arab conquests. At times of national calamities, tales of this type were probably often told at all levels of society, offering explanation, comfort and hope. Thus, it seems, a recognizable apocalyptic genre developed, purporting to recount prophecies foretelling the disasters that had in fact already befallen the Iranians, but also telling of decisive changes of fortune which were destined to restore the community to its previous glory in due course.

That the Iranian civilization was known for its apocalyptic tradition in late antiquity is suggested by the title and contents of a Graeco-Roman work which is no longer extant, the 'Oracles of Hystaspes' (Hystaspes being the Greek version of the name of Zarathustra's patron, Vishtaspa), citations from which suggest that it contained some genuine Zoroastrian material.¹⁰⁹

On the historical evaluation of apocalyptic sources 'Apocalyptic' tales probably continued to be told in some milieus – as part of the priestly tradition, but possibly also as entertaining popular stories – long after the original traumas had healed. It seems likely that, in the priestly tradition at least, a standard account of such tales eventually emerged which was best calculated to fit in with the tradition as a whole.¹¹⁰ At times of new catastrophes such accepted, 'structured' versions probably generated a variety of popular tales.

It has been noted that traditions which evolve in the course of long oral transmission tend to develop in such a way that they contain references to the time of a group's origins and again to events which affected the last few generations, but mention nothing in between.¹¹¹ In other words, in an account which originated in the Hellenistic period and continued to be told until it was finally written down in the ninth century CE, the descriptions of most of the

protagonists and events may reflect what seemed significant in the latter period, and show few traces of the reality of the fourth or third century BCE.

It is not possible, therefore, to scrutinize and evaluate written versions of this type by means of philological and critical methods designed to deal with written traditions. In the case of Zoroastrianism, an additional problem is posed by the nature of the *Zand* (on which see above). About three-quarters of the Avesta as it existed in Sasanian times are now lost,¹¹² and it is widely assumed that some Pahlavi texts are based on the *Zand* of genuine Avestan texts which are no longer extant. On the other hand, the *Zand* system clearly allowed the priesthood to incorporate new or foreign material into the Zoroastrian tradition.

The 'metallic ages' and the *Zand-i Wahman Yasn* In the scholarly discussion of the past decades, the question of the origins of Iranian apocalyptic ideas is closely connected with the status of the myth of the metallic ages (see above), since the myth is most elaborately described in the *Zand-i Wahman Yasn*, and has been taken to provide a framework there for various accounts of an 'apocalyptic' nature. The details of the academic discussion, which is only tangentially relevant to the subject under discussion, are too intricate to be examined in the present context. It may suffice, therefore, to allude to some of the main assumptions made there and to offer some considerations.

1. Most authors view the ZWY essentially as one text – either as an ancient composition consisting of the *Zand* of a lost *Yasht* to the Amesha Spenta Vohu Manah (Pahl. *Wahman*), or as a very late one reflecting the miseries of the Zoroastrian community in post-Sasanian times. The chief proponent of the latter view, Ph. Gignoux, strongly argues that no Avestan *Yasht* to Vohu Manah (Pahl. *Wahman Yasht* or *Yasn*), and consequently no *Zand* to such a text, can have existed.

2. Hultgård (1991), who advances arguments in favour of the existence of an Avestan original of the *Wahman Yasht*, somewhat hesitantly seems to suggest that the myth of the metallic ages formed part of this ancient hymn. Gignoux¹¹³ argues that the story derives from the Biblical Daniel 2: 37–40.¹¹⁴ Boyce, who assumes that an Avestan *Wahman Yasht* existed and that the core of the ZWY is based on its *Zand*, nevertheless regards the concept of the metallic ages as a borrowing from Greek culture which entered the Zoroastrian tradition in the period following the Macedonian conquest of Iran.

Boyce's views imply that at least one major element of the ZWY did not belong to the Avestan tradition. Hultgård¹¹⁵ admits the same thing for other parts of that text. This in itself suggests that, instead of approaching it as though it were essentially an organic whole, it may be preferable to regard the

text as a late compilation, a book written to bring together various apocalyptic traditions at a time when the priesthood was concerned to preserve the essential parts of the faith in written form. (Such a procedure would naturally have forced the compilers to impose some sort of logical order on this material, giving it a superficial semblance of coherence.) If the extant ZWY cannot be shown to be based on a single Avestan text but is more likely to be a composite work, then it cannot be assumed that all its contents must go back to an ancient Iranian tradition, and consequently it cannot be used as evidence of an ancient Iranian origin of the myth of the 'metallic ages'.

As we saw earlier, the character of most Pahlavi texts is essentially ahistorical. Given that no Avestan origin can be proved, views on the time of the emergence of the 'metallic ages' in the Zoroastrian tradition can therefore be based only on considerations of plausibility. Since no known passage of the Avesta suggests that the appearance of Zarathustra marked the beginning of a steady decline – a notion that would be wholly contrary to the spirit of the *Gathas* – an ancient Zoroastrian origin can probably be excluded.¹¹⁶ There would therefore appear to be two possible scenarios:

1. Some time after the time of the composition of Daniel 2 in the second century BCE,¹¹⁷ but most probably after the Islamic conquest, Zoroastrians were sufficiently impressed with a late Jewish text to incorporate it into their tradition, and this was done so successfully that the text soon came to be seen as part of Zarathustra's revelation.

2. During the period following the overthrow of the Achaemenian empire by Alexander 'the Accursed', the mood of the Zoroastrian community was one of gloom. As the evidence of Theopompus (*apud* Plutarch, see above) suggests, the notion that the fortunes of the ages are predetermined had already gained at least some acceptance. At this period, when Hellenism was becoming a dominant cultural influence in Iran, the Greek myth of the metallic ages was introduced there and its implied pessimism aptly reflected the mood of the Zoroastrian faithful, who accepted it as part of religious truth.

Clearly, the latter account would seem more plausible.

Conclusion

Mary Boyce¹¹⁸ defines 'revolutionary millenarianism' as 'a type of salvation-belief which has arisen characteristically "against a background of disaster", when rapidly changing social conditions have caused suffering and disorientation for a minority, and have brought forth a prophet who assures them of the compensation and triumphant happiness in a time to come'. She calls Zarathustra 'not only the fountain-head of Iranian apocalyptic,¹¹⁹ but also the

first known millenarian in the wider sense of that term'. Moreover, she maintains that 'Zoroastrianism is in fact the archetypal millenarian faith, to which most subsequent millenarian movements may well owe a historical debt'. Whether some of these contentions are accepted as true clearly depends on one's definition of the concepts in question. However, without Zarathustra's original teaching that the world will have an end – preceded by a final battle and a moral reckoning, a retribution which will banish evil for ever – the notion of a preordained and 'moral' future of the universe would be unthinkable. Such beliefs of course lie at the heart of both millenarian and apocalyptic ideas.

Further speculation on the Last Things, which were apparently thought of as 'mirroring' the events of Creation and the time of Zarathustra, led to the development of the concepts of a world-saviour, Zarathustra's son born of a virgin mother, and of a physical resurrection of the dead; again, potent images in the history of millenarian ideas that was to follow.

When the concept of time came to be seen as being of crucial importance – partly no doubt under foreign influence – the originally vague notion that Good would eventually vanquish Evil in a world which essentially belongs to Ohrmazd became more defined and led to truly 'millenarian' speculations: a predestined, 'moral' future for the world, conceived in terms of periods and ages of 1,000 and 3,000 years.

Later, when the Macedonian and Arab conquests confronted the community with catastrophe, a legend of alien origin, that of the metallic ages, apparently helped the Zoroastrians deal with the trauma. As this legend depicted the future of the world in familiar terms of 'ages', it was accepted as part of Zoroastrian teaching and probably facilitated the development of a rich apocalyptic tradition.

As usually happens with oral traditions, pre-Islamic Zoroastrianism shaped these apocalyptic and millenary accounts until they had reached the form most relevant and satisfying to the community. After the advent of Islam, the second major catastrophe in the history of the religion, these accounts came to play an important role. In this way a tradition which for the most part had its origin in the remote past of the Iranian people, but some of whose elements came from outside Iran, eventually received the final redaction which has so impressed many scholars in the field of apocalyptic and millenarian studies.

6. Robert H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York, 1948), p. 15: 'ancient Hebrew retained the harshness of the desert, a Bedouin virility marked by staccato tones, vigorous doubled consonants ... and deep-throated, rasping, guttural sounds'.
7. W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, trans. from the German of Caspari, and edited, with Numerous Additions and Corrections (London, 1874) Vol. 1, p. ix. Compare Giorgio Levi della Vida, *Les Sémites et leur rôle dans l'histoire religieuse* (Paris, 1938), p. 35: 'Qui dit Sémite dit donc nomade'.
8. James H. Breasted, 'The Scene of the Evolution of Civilization and the Great White Race', in *The Conquest of Civilization* (New York, 1926), pp. 11–12. The greatest Near Eastern historian of the period, Eduard Meyer, in his *Geschichte des Altertums*, 4th edn (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1921), Vol. I, Part 2, p. 417, finds that 'große selbständige Schöpfungen haben sie [=the Semites] kaum hervorgebracht; und so gut wie gänzlich verschlossen ist ihnen das Gebiet der philosophischen Spekulationen'.
9. For a recent general discussion, see Marc Van de Mieroop, *Cuneiform Texts and the Writing of History* (London, 1999), pp. 111–14.
10. Norman Cohn, *Cosmos, Chaos, and the World to Come: The Ancient Roots of Apocalyptic Faith* (New Haven, CT, 1993), p. 56. Cohn's preoccupation with 'chaos', a Greek concept he imports into Mesopotamia, seems to me to skew his presentation of Mesopotamian evidence.
11. Wolfram von Soden, 'Die Frage nach der Rechtigkeit Gottes im alten Orient', *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 96 (1965): 41–55, quotation translated from p. 58.
12. J. W. Swain, 'The Theory of the Four Monarchies, Opposition History under the Roman Empire', *Classical Philology* 35 (1940): 1–21.
13. Damian Thompson, *The End of Time: Faith and Fear in the Shadow of the Millennium* (Hanover, NH, 1996); A. A. Vasiliev, 'Medieval Ideas of the End of the World: East and West', *Byzantion* 16 (1942–43): 462–502.
14. Translation by Stanley Burstein, 'The Babyloniaca of Berossus', *Sources and Monographs, Sources for the Ancient Near East* 1, no. 5 (1978): 15, with discussion and references to earlier work.
15. W. G. Lambert, 'Berossus and Babylonian Eschatology', *Iraq* 38 (1976): 171–3.
16. J. J. A. van Dijk, 'Textes divers du Musée du Baghdad', *Sumer* 18 (1962): 29, collected references he took to refer to a 'jour de damnation' in Sumerian literature, but this did not find wide acceptance.
17. A. K. Grayson, 'The Babylonian Origin of Apocalyptic Literature', *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* CXLVIII (1989–90), Classe di Scienze Morali, Lettere ed Arti, 203–21, with earlier bibliography, quoting his translation of the passage.
18. W. G. Lambert, *The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic* (London, 1978). For more on this vast subject, see *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York, 1992), s.v. 'Eschatology'.
19. For an introduction, see B. Schmidt, 'Flood Narratives of Ancient Western Asia', in Sasson et al. (eds), *Civilizations*, pp. 2337–52. See also E. A. Speiser, 'The Past as Seen by the Mesopotamians', in Robert C. Dentan (ed.), *The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East* (New Haven, CT, 1955), pp. 49–55.
20. This version was included in the Akkadian Epic of Gilgamesh, for which see A. George, *The Epic of Gilgamesh, A New Translation* (London, 1999), pp. 88–95.
21. For a translation and bibliography of the text, see Benjamin R. Foster, *Before the Muses, An Anthology of Akkadian Literature* (Bethesda, MD, 1996), pp. 160–85.
22. Thorkild Jacobsen, 'The Eridu Genesis', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 (1981): 513–29, esp. 520–1.
23. Translation adapted from Bendt Alster, 'Dilmun, Bahrain, and the Alleged Paradise in Sumerian Myth and Literature', in D. Potts (ed.), *Dilmun, New Studies in the Archaeology and*

- Early History of Bahrain*, Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient 2 (Berlin, 1983), pp. 39–74; see p. 58.
24. Stefan M. Maul, 'Zukunftsbewältigung, Eine Untersuchung altorientalischen Denkens anhand der babylonisch-assyrischen Löserituale (Namburbi)', *Baghdader Forschungen* 18 (Mainz, 1994): 3–4.
 25. J. J. A. van Dijk, 'Sumerische Religion', in J. Asmussen et al. (eds), *Handbuch der Religionsgeschichte* 1 (Göttingen, 1971), pp. 440–2.
 26. J. Bottéro, *La plus vieille religion en Mésopotamie* (Paris, 1998).
 27. W. G. Lambert, 'The Cosmology of Sumer and Babylon', in C. Blacker et al. (eds), *Ancient Cosmologies* (London, 1975), pp. 42–65.
 28. W. G. Lambert, 'Enuma Elish', *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York, 1992).
 29. W. G. Lambert, 'History and the Gods: A Review Article', *Orientalia* 39 (1970): 170–7.
 30. Francesca Rochberg-Halton, 'Fate and Divination in Mesopotamia', *Archiv für Orientforschung*, 19 (1982): 363–71.
 31. J. Bottéro, 'Symptômes, signes, écritures', in J. Vernant (ed.), *Divination et rationalité* (Paris, 1974), pp. 70–197.
 32. Igor S. Klotchkoff, *Dukhovnaja Kultura Vavilonii: Chelovek, Sud'ba, Vremja* (Moscow, 1983).
 33. Compare George, *Gilgamesh*, p. 95.
 34. J. Bottéro, 'The Mythology of Death', in *Mesopotamia: Writing, Reasoning, and the Gods*, trans. Zainab Bahrani and Marc Van de Mieroop (Chicago, IL, 1987), pp. 268–86.
 35. Foster, *Before the Muses*, p. 722.
 36. F. R. Kraus, *Vom mesopotamischen Mensch der altbabylonischen Zeit und seiner Welt*, Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, AFD. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks 36, no. 6 (Amsterdam, 1973).
 37. Foster, *Before the Muses*, p. 333.
 38. *Ibid.*, pp. 894–5.
 39. Compare George, *Gilgamesh*, p. 124.
 40. von Soden, 'Die Frage nach der Rechtigkeit'.
 41. Foster, *Before the Muses*, p. 801.

2. Millennialism and Eschatology in the Zoroastrian Tradition

Author's Note: I am indebted to Dr A. F. de Jong for reading an earlier draft of this chapter and for his valuable suggestions.

The following abbreviations will be used here: AJ: *Ayadgar i Jamaspig*; Av.: *Avestan*; Dk.: *Denkard*; Gbd: *Greater Bundahishn*; Gk.: Greek; Phl.: Pahlavi; Vend: *Vendidad*; Y: *Yasna*; Yt. *Yasht*; Zdspr: *Wizidagiha i Zadsparam*; ZWY: *Zand-i Wahman Yasn*.

1. He played a prominent role in the 'religionsgeschichtliche Schule', see Anders Hultgård, 'Bahman Yasht: A Persian Apocalypse', in J. J. Collins and J. H. Charlesworth (eds), *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (Sheffield, 1991), p. 115.
2. R. Reitzenstein, 'Vom Töpferorakel zu Hesrod', in R. Reitzenstein and E. Schaefer (eds), *Studein zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1926).
3. As the status of the account of the metallic ages in the context of Zoroastrian teaching and belief is unknown, and may moreover have changed in the course of time, both 'myth' and 'legend' are here used somewhat loosely when referring to it.

4. See F. Delitzsch, 'Daniel', in *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* (Berlin, 1855), on which see further Hultgård, 'Bahman', p. 116.

5. Hultgård, 'Bahman', cautiously advances arguments in favour of an ancient Iranian origin of the myth, without further comment on the relative antiquity of this and non-Iranian legends.

6. For arguments in favour of strong Iranian influences in this field see e.g. Mary Boyce, 'On the Antiquity of the Zoroastrian Apocalyptic', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 47 (London, 1984): pp. 57–75; Mary Boyce and Frantz Grenet, *A History of Zoroastrianism*, Vol. 3 (Leiden and New York, 1992); and Hultgård, 'Bahman'. Against, see e.g. Phillipe Gignoux, 'Nouveaux regards sur l'apocalyphe iranienne', *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (Paris, 1986). C. G. Ceretti's *The Zand-i Wahman Yasn: A Zoroastrian Apocalypse* (Rome, 1995) offers a survey of the debate, although the conclusions he draws seem ill-founded.

7. Some scholars insist, for example, on regarding 'eschatology' and 'apocalypticism' as entirely separate phenomena, e.g. Gignoux, 'Nouveaux regards', p. 335, whereas the Zoroastrian scriptural tradition consistently presents both as parts of one divinely ordained scheme of things.

8. The term 'Pahlavi' denotes the Middle Persian language as written by Zoroastrians (as opposed to 'Manichaean Middle Persian').

9. The few later accounts clearly depend on the Pahlavi tradition and show no sign of further development.

10. This account is largely based on GBd 1–5, and on the work of Zadsparam, with some reference to the evidence of the ZWY.

11. Iranian names and terms are given here in their simplest form, without length-marks or other special signs.

12. For a further description of this early stage see Mary Boyce, *Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism* (Manchester, 1984), pp. 16–17; Philip G. Kreyenbroek, 'Cosmogony and Cosmology in Zoroastrianism/Mazdaism', in E. Yarshater (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, Vol. 6, Part 3 (Costa Mesa, 1993), pp. 303–7.

13. See GBd 1a.15ff.

14. Zadspr 3.77f; see also Philip G. Kreyenbroek, 'Mithra and Ahreman in Iranian Cosmogonies', in J. R. Hinnells (ed.), *Studies in Mithraism* (Rome, 1994).

15. In later accounts the seventh of these, the 'Beneficent Spirit' (*Spenta Mainyu*) was identified with Ohrmazd himself, so that Ohrmazd became one of the seven; see latterly Philip G. Kreyenbroek, 'On Spenta Mainyu's Role in the Zoroastrian Cosmogony', in A. Bromberg (ed.), *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 7 (Bloomfield Hills, 1993).

16. Representing perhaps the need to exercise one's choice by adhering to the power of good.

17. Thus 'Righteousness' has a special link with fire, 'Good Thought' with the animal world, and 'Beneficent Devotion' with the earth.

18. So GBd 1.47–9.

19. GBd 1.23–4 (B. T. Anklesaria, *Zand-Akasiḥ: Iranian or Greater Bundahism* [Bombay, 1956], p. 45).

20. GBd 3.23–4.

21. See GBd 30 in Anklesaria, *Zand-Akasiḥ*, pp. 256–63. A neutral purgatory (Phl. *hammistanagan*, Av. *misvan gatu*) is said to exist for those whose good thoughts, words and actions are entirely balanced by their wicked ones (GBd 30.32–3; for the Avestan term see C. Bartholomae, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* (Strassburg, 1904), pp. 1186–7).

22. Stanley Insler, in his *Gathas of Zarathustra* (Tehran and Liège, 1975) translates Av. *frasha-* as 'healed, renovated', which yields admirable sense; against this interpretation see, however, H.-P. Schmidt, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 21 (Dordrecht, 1979): 97–8.

23. GBd 34.36–8. The term 'essence' translates Phl. *xwarnah*, a complex concept concerned with light, glory and, probably, fertility.

24. See GBd 34 in Anklesaria, *Zand-Akasiḥ*, pp. 283–93.

25. There are some exceptions; thus the *Ayadgar i Jamaspig* (27.3; in G. S. I. Messina, *Libro Apocalittico Persiano Ayatkur i Zamaspiḥ* [Rome, 1939], p. 119) implies that the first of Zarathustra's future sons, Ushedar, will be succeeded by Ushedarmah after 500 years.

26. On the earlier non-Iranian sources see further below. On the late origin of the idea of a 'spiritual ideal' stage see Kreyenbroek, '*Spenta Mainyu*'. Against the notion that such variations reflect deeper doctrinal differences see A. F. De Jong, *Traditions of the Magi: Zoroastrianism in Greek and Latin Literature* (Leiden, New York and Cologne, 1997), p. 200, n. 160.

27. GBd 1.14.

28. GBd 1.28.

29. GBd 1.37ff; 3.2.

30. GBd 1.53; cf. 3.12ff.

31. GBd 1a.

32. GBd 1.47ff.

33. GBd 3.23

34. See GBd 33.1–11.

35. Such legends were later described in detail in Ferdowsi's *Shahnama*.

36. GBd 32.13–30; AJ 15.3–28.

37. GBd 32.27; ZWY 81–5. On Wāhram see further below.

38. For this interpretation of Phl. '*syn QDM gwnyht*', see Gignoux, 'Nouveaux regards'.

39. The four ages are mentioned in *Zand-i Wahman Yasn* 1; the seven in ZWY 3. For a survey of further Zoroastrian sources where the two version of this legend (with four and seven ages respectively) occur, see Boyce, 'Antiquity'.

40. For a survey of the legends surrounding Zarathustra's three saviour-sons, see H. G. Kippenberg, 'Die Geschichte der Mittelpersischen apokalyptischen Traditionen', *Studia Iranica* 7 (Paris, 1978): 54.

41. See GBd 33.29–31. Mention is also made (GBd 33.30) of the return of some of the men and animals who have been sheltered from the beginning of time in the mythical *war* (enclosure) of Yima.

42. ZWY 9.8.

43. So ZWY 9.11.

44. So ZWY 9.13–23, similarly GBd 33.34–5, where raising Kercasp from the dead is said to have been Saoshyant's first act of resurrection.

45. The process is described clearly and elaborately in GBd 33.

46. Pace J. Kellens and E. Pirart, *Les textes vieux-avestiques* (Wiesbaden, 1988), it is assumed here that the author of the *Gathas* was indeed a historical person called Zarathustra.

47. See Philip G. Kreyenbroek, 'On the Shaping of Zoroastrian Theology: Ashi, Verethraghna and the Amesha Spentas', in P. Bernard and F. Grenet (eds), *Histoire et Cultes de l'Asie Centrale* (Paris, 1991).

48. See Mary Boyce, *A History of Zoroastrianism*, Vol. 2 (Leiden and Cologne, 1982), pp. 7–9.

49. While there is general agreement that the later Achaemenians were Zoroastrians, there is still some debate as to when and how Zoroastrianism came to be established in western Iran. The best-founded and most likely view, however, is that the Achaemenians were already Zoroastrians when they came to power. See Mary Boyce, *A History of Zoroastrianism*, Vol. 1 (Leiden, 1975), pp. 41ff.

50. For a more detailed account see Philip G. Kreyenbroek, 'The Zoroastrian Tradition

from an Oralists' Point of View', in B. S. Desai and J. J. Modi (eds), *K.R. Cama Oriental Institute, Second International Congress Proceedings* (Bombay, 1996).

51. A later tradition, purporting that two copies of the entire Avesta had been written down but were subsequently destroyed by Alexander the Macedonian (see Boyce, *Textual Sources*), can safely be regarded as a myth.

52. There is a rigid division in Zoroastrianism between priestly and lay families.

53. See P. G. Kreyenbroek, 'The Dadestan i Denig on Priests', *Indo-Iranian Journal* 30 (Dordrecht, 1987).

54. See Kreyenbroek, 'Zoroastrian Tradition'.

55. Whence the expression 'Zend-Avesta', which is sometimes used as a synonym of Avesta.

56. See Boyce, *Zoroastrians*, p. 81.

57. *Ibid.*, pp. 111ff., and especially p. 114.

58. It is possible that this process was completed during the reign of Khusraw I (531–578), see M. Boyce, *Zoroastrians: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices* (Boston, 1979), p. 135.

59. See e.g. the oeuvre of M. Boyce, and Philip G. Kreyenbroek, *Sraosha in the Zoroastrian Tradition* (Leiden, 1985).

60. Translation H. Humbach, *The Gathas of Zarathustra and Other Old Avestan Texts*, 2 vols (Heidelberg, 1991), p. 131.

61. Translation Humbach, *Gathas*, p. 170. Humbach, however, translates Av. *cinuato perequm* as 'the account keeper's bridge'.

62. i.e., presumably, for all time until the Renovation, see below.

63. cf. Humbach, *Gathas*, p. 46; Insler, *Gathas*, p. 83.

64. On this see also Y 30.4.

65. Translation Insler, *Gathas*, p. 105. Further passages where fire is mentioned in this context include Y 31.3; 47.1.

66. Translation Insler, *Gathas*, p. 61.

67. *Ibid.*, p. 35.

68. Y 34.15: 'By your rule, Lord, Thou shalt truly heal this world (*ferashem-dafi*) in accord with your wish'. See Insler, *Gathas*, p. 59.

69. So Bartholomae, *Wörterbuch*, p. 1561; cf. H. Lommel, *Die Religion Zarathustras: Nach Dem Avesta Dargestellt* (Tübingen, 1930), pp. 226ff.

70. Insler, *Gathas*, p. 81, n. 2.

71. Translation Insler, *Gathas*, p. 93.

72. Two further verses, Y 34.13; 53.2, refer to the *daena* of the *sayoshiyant*; the precise meaning of the term *daena* is debated, and the passages do not appear to throw light on the present discussion.

73. Lommel, *Religion*, p. 226 defines the meaning of the term as: 'who in future will accomplish the activity denoted by *sa*'. This still implies, however, that the event will be achieved by the *Saoshiyant* during his lifetime.

74. This is suggested by Boyce in 'Antiquity', who argues that this realization led Zarathustra to postulate that another, greater *Saoshiyant* would come after him. The *Gathas* appear to offer no evidence of this, however, and the later tradition frequently uses the word 'saoshiyant' in the plural, possibly to describe the entire membership of the congregation (Y 14.1; 61.5; 70.4; Visperd 11.13). This suggests that the term continued to be used in a non-specific sense until a relatively late date. See further below.

75. cf. such terms as 'the final turning point of creation' (Y 43.5).

76. In other non-Gathic passages the word is used to refer to 'us', i.e. to members of the community generally (Y 14.1; 61.5; 70.4); to an indefinite number of figures qualified by

adjectives suggesting a connection with *Frashegerd* (Y 12.7; 24.5; Yt 13.17, 38; 19.22); and to a single saviour (Y 26.10; 59.28; Vend 19.5).

77. With minor alterations, the translation is that of Boyce, 'Antiquity'.

78. So all MSS (K. F. Geldner, *Avesta: The Sacred Books of the Parsis*, 3 vols (Stuttgart, 1896), Vol. 2, p. 256), and also A. Hintze, *Der Zamyad Yast* (Wiesbaden, 1994), p. 365. Boyce, 'Antiquity', p. 58, emends the genitive plural form to the accusative singular and translates 'the victorious *Saoshiyant*'.

79. i.e. 'he who embodies truth', the name of the final saviour, which derives from a Gathic passage (Y 43.16), see Boyce, 'Antiquity', pp. 57–8.

80. i.e., his mother, whose name means 'who shall overcome all'.

81. The passage is followed by an account of the final battle between good and evil forces (Yt 19.95–6).

82. Here follows a corrupt passage.

83. For this translation see H. Humbach, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 63 (Berlin, 1957): 43, n. 7.

84. This section is preceded by an apparently unrelated text dealing with geographical topics (Yt 19.1–8).

85. His name further occurs in Yt 13.110, 117, 128, as part of lists of venerable figures.

86. See W. W. Malandra, *An Introduction to Ancient Iranian Religions: Readings from the Avesta and the Achaemenid Inscriptions* (Minneapolis, MN, 1983), p. 145.

87. Av. *savayat*, from the same root as the word *saoshiyant*.

88. Av. *astvat*.

89. On this subject cf. M. V. Cerutti, *Antropologia e apocalittica* (Rome, 1990).

90. See Boyce, *History*, Vol. 1, pp. 186, 188.

91. His name occurs in Yt 13.98; Y 26.5; 23.2. On Zarathustra's three 'naturally-born' sons, see further below.

92. For a more detailed discussion of this figure see Boyce, *Antiquity*, p. 59–67.

93. Boyce, 'Antiquity', p. 67.

94. See above. For a survey of sources mentioning 9,000 and 12,000 years respectively, see R. C. Zaehner, *Zurvan: A Zoroastrian Dilemma* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 96–7. Zaehner's conclusions from these data, however, would now be regarded as outdated.

95. See e.g. Boyce, *History*, Vol. 2, pp. 234ff. Boyce strongly links the development of these ideas with the Babylonian concept of a 'great year', the period of time it would take all heavenly bodies to complete the full cycle of their movements. In her earlier work, *History*, Vol. 1, p. 234, Boyce claims that 'in every "Great Year" the events of the preceding "Great Years" were thought to be exactly repeated, to infinity'. However, she later qualified this view by admitting that 'no trace ... of a theory of recurrent cycles of events has been found in Babylonian cuneiform texts' (Boyce, 'Antiquity', p. 67, n. 77), and suggested that 'this was possibly a development of Hellenistic times'. For an alternative explanation see below.

96. See e.g. the accounts of Eznik of Kolb and Theodore bar Konay in Zaehner, *Zurvan*, pp. 420ff.

97. Such as the notion of a god greater than Ohrmazd and the implication that Ohrmazd and Ahriman have the same origin.

98. Boyce, *History*, Vol. 2, p. 236.

99. S. Shaked, 'The Myth of Zurvan: Cosmogony and Eschatology', in I. Gruenwald, S. Shaked and G. G. Stroumsa (eds), *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity Presented to David Flusser* (Tübingen, 1992), p. 232.

100. See e.g. my remarks on Yezidism in *Yezidism: Its Background, Observances and Textual Tradition* (Leviston, 1995), pp. 19–20.

101. So De Jong, *Traditions*, pp. 164–5, on the basis of the translation by J. Gwyn Griffiths, *Plutarch's De Iside et Osiride* (Cardiff, 1970).
102. Boyce, 'Antiquity', p. 67, n. 77.
103. The details of Plutarch's story do not correspond exactly with those found in the Pahlavi tradition, but it seems likely that, while the division into three or four periods of 3,000 years was widely accepted, various speculative traditions existed among Zoroastrians as to the precise sequence of events (see e.g. S. Shaked, *Dualism in Transformation: Varieties of Religion in Sasanian Iran* [London, 1994]).
104. See Zaehner, *Zurvan*, pp. 419ff.
105. So Boyce, *Textual Sources*, p. 97.
106. Translation by Boyce, *Textual Sources*, p. 97.
107. For a survey of the variations reported by later Arabic accounts see S. Shaked, 'Some Islamic Reports Concerning Zoroastrianism', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 17 (Jerusalem, 1994): 43–84.
108. Yt 3.98; GBd 35.56; the latter passage is followed by a reference to the 'miraculously-born' sons in GBd 35.59.
109. See Boyce and Grenet, *History*, Vol. 3, pp. 376ff.
110. On this process, which often plays a role in the shaping of oral history, see J. Vansina, *Oral Tradition and History* (London, 1985), p. 168.
111. *Ibid.*, pp. 168–9.
112. See e.g. Boyce, *Textual Sources*, p. 3.
113. Gignoux, 'Nouveaux Regards', p. 339; this account of the relationship between the two texts was first proposed by J. Duchesne-Guillemin, 'Apocalypse juive et apocalypse iranienne', in U. Bianchi and M. J. Vermaseren (eds), *La Soteriologia dei Culti Orientali nell'impero Romano* (Leiden, 1982).
114. On this subject see also the work of David Flusser.
115. Hultgård, 'Bahman Yasht', p. 132.
116. For further reasons for dismissing this idea see Boyce, 'Antiquity', pp. 70–1.
117. On the date of the Book of Daniel see Boyce and Grenet, *History*, Vol. 3, p. 401.
118. Boyce, 'Antiquity', p. 74.
119. 'Apocalyptic' in her work (Boyce, 'Antiquity', p. 57) is defined as 'another word for "revelation"', and it is stressed that no essential distinction exists in Zoroastrianism between prophecy and apocalyptic.

3. The Biblical Roots of Apocalyptic

1. Klaus Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic* (London, 1972), pp. 36–97; Walter Schmitthals, *The Apocalyptic Movement* (Nashville, TN, 1975); Paul Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia, PA, 1975), pp. 1–31.
2. See Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*; John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London, 1997); John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 2nd edn (Grand Rapids, OH, 1998); John J. Collins, 'From Prophecy to Apocalypticism: The Expectation of the End', in John J. Collins (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*, Vol. 1 (New York, 1997); Stephen L. Cook, *Prophecy and Apocalypticism* (Minneapolis, MN, 1995).
3. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, pp. 1–19.
4. Robert Wilson, 'From Prophecy to Apocalyptic: Reflections on the Shape of Israelite Religion', *Semeia* 21 (1981): 79–95; Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, pp. 37–8. See also Cook, *Prophecy*, pp. 19–54.

5. See Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*.
6. Cook, *Prophecy*, pp. 12–54.
7. See Wayne Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven, CT, 1983).
8. John J. Collins, 'The Jewish Apocalypses', *Semeia* 14 (1979): 21–59.
9. Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, pp. 1–31.
10. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, pp. 11–12.
11. Andres Hultgård, 'Persian Apocalypticism', in J. J. Collins (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*, Vol. 1, pp. 39–83; Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, pp. 29–37; see also Mary Boyce, 'Persian Religion in the Achaemenid Age', in W. D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein (eds), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1984).
12. Robert R. Wilson, *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia, PA, 1984), pp. 119–23; William W. Hallo, 'Akkadian Apocalypses', *Israel Exploration Journal* 16 (1966): 231–42; Tremper Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography* (Winona Lake, IN, 1991).
13. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, pp. 26–9.
14. Wilson, *Prophecy and Society*, pp. 124–8; Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, pp. 33–7.
15. Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*; Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, pp. 23–5.
16. Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*.

4. Eschatological Dynamics and Utopian Ideals in Early Judaism

1. On the early scholarship on the subject see J. M. Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalypsik* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1969); P. D. Hanson, 'Prolegomena to the Study of Jewish Apocalyptic', in F. M. Cross et al. (eds), *Munalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God* (Garden City, NY, 1976), pp. 389–413.
2. F. Lücke, *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung iohannis und in die gesamte apokalyptische Literatur* (Bonn, 1832).
3. R. Laurence, *The Book of Enoch the Prophet* (Oxford, 1921).
4. E.g. F. D. Mazzaferri, *The Genre of the Book of Revelation from a Source Critical Perspective* (BZNW 54; Berlin, 1989).
5. R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1913).
6. H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (London, 1944).
7. See e.g. O. Plöger, *Theocracy and Eschatology* (Richmond, VA, 1968).
8. P. D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia, PA, 1975).
9. G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Vol. 2 (4th edn, Munich, 1965).
10. So R. E. Sturm, 'Defining the Word "Apocalyptic": A Problem in Biblical Criticism', in J. Marcus and M. L. Soards (eds), *Apocalyptic and the New Testament (Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplement 24)* (Sheffield, 1989), pp. 17–48.
11. K. Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic* (Naperville and London, 1972).
12. J. J. Collins (ed.), *Apocalypse. The Morphology of a Genre (Semeia 14)* (Missoula, MT, 1979).
13. J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 2nd edn (Grand Rapids, MI, 1998).
14. J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols (New York, 1983, 1985).

**Imagining the End: Visions of
Apocalypse from the Ancient Middle
East to Modern America**

Edited by Abbas Amanat and
Magnus Bernhardsson

I.B.Tauris *Publishers*
LONDON • NEW YORK

BS
877
I43
2002

Published in 2002 by I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd,
6 Salem Road, London W2 4BU
175 Fifth Avenue, New York NY 10010
www.ibtauris.com

In the United States of America and in Canada distributed by
St. Martin's Press, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York NY 10010

Copyright © I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd, 2002

All rights reserved. Except for brief quotations in a review, this book, or any part thereof, may not be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

ISBN 1 86064 724 3

A full CIP record for this book is available from the British Library
A full CIP record for this book is available from the Library of Congress

Library of Congress catalog card: available

Set in Monotype Ehrhardt and Franklin Gothic Heavy by Ewan Smith, London
Printed and bound in Great Britain by MPG Books Ltd, Bodmin, Cornwall

Revised 2/10/03 BLACKWELL 40320503

Contents

Preface	vii
List of Contributors	ix
 Introduction: Apocalyptic Anxieties and Millennial Hopes in the Salvation Religions of the Middle East	 I
<i>Abbas Amanat</i>	
 Part I Origins	
1 Mesopotamia and the End of Time	23
<i>Benjamin R. Foster</i>	
2 Millennialism and Eschatology in the Zoroastrian Tradition	33
<i>Philip G. Kreyenbroek</i>	
3 The Biblical Roots of Apocalyptic	56
<i>Robert R. Wilson</i>	
 Part II Judaism, Christianity and Islam	
4 Eschatological Dynamics and Utopian Ideals in Early Judaism	69
<i>John J. Collins</i>	
5 The Messiah and the Millennium: The Roots of Two Jewish- Christian Symbols	90
<i>Harold W. Attridge</i>	
6 Messianism, Millennialism and Revolution in Early Islamic History	106
<i>Said Amir Arjomand</i>	